Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 1210 Case file # 95A-HQ-1027167.

Material Examiner Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 1:00 PM (Time), 09 / 15 / 99 (Date)

File #: 95-1027167

Laboratory #(s): 20504028

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X	☐		☐	☐
QY	☐	X		☐	☐
	☐			☐	☐

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of:

Testimony Date(s): Pages:

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 20504028 Date: Mar 23, 1993

Laboratory Number: Date:

Laboratory Number: Date:

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ and unknown technician

Laboratory Number: 20504028

Initials: Srd

Was any other material reviewed? X Yes No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: Submitting agency letter dated May 1, 1992

Results of Review

File #: 95-1027167 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1, K2

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)? ☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ Unable to Determine 3

2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

☑ Transcript not available.

3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unable to Determine
4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unable to Determine
5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unable to Determine

Initials: Sma

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-1027167

#1. The examiner chose to perform solubility tests on the K fibers. Infrared analysis was available at this time and is a much more specific analysis and allows for the determination of the polymer sub-class of a synthetic fiber. Infrared analysis should have been performed on beige and gray K and Q fibers.

#2. The results are not adequately documented in the notes. The notes are not dated and are in pencil. The technician did not initial the notes. The spectra for the beige known fiber is marked "K1" and should be "K2". The hair was deemed unsuitable for comparison with no documented reason or explanation.

Review completed at: 1:30 PM (Time), 09 / 15 / 99 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 1/2 hour

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Robertson 9-15-99
(Signature) (Date)

Initials: SMR